

## REMARKS

Claims 1-43 are pending in the Application. Claims 1, 7, 20, 23, 27, and 31 are independent claims. No new matter has been added. Entry of the amendment is respectfully requested. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

## Claim Status

Claims 1 and 2 were rejected as anticipated by Do (U.S. 6,508,397).

Claims 3-13 and 20-22 were rejected as obvious over Do.

Claims 14-19 and 23-30 were indicated allowable if rewritten in an independent form. It is respectfully submitted that claims 23 and 27 are now allowable as they have been rewritten in an independent form, as requested.

Claims 31-43 were indicated allowable.

## The Objections

The Applicants respectfully traverse the objections. Nevertheless, the claims have been modified as requested to advance prosecution. Applicants respectfully submit that the requested objection-related modifications did not change the scope of the claims.

## The Rejections

The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections. Do does not teach or suggest the recited features and relationships. Nor would it have been obvious to have modified Do to have included the recited features and relationships.

### Claim 1

Amended claim 1 includes features from original claim 3. Do does not teach or suggest a convex mirror in the manner recited. The main purpose of Do's mirror is to prevent the camera (103) from being visible to customers (col. 10, lines 1-7). There is no teaching or suggestion in Do of using a convex mirror to conceal an ATM camera. Contrarily, Do teaches against having a convex mirror. In Do, the "camera's field of view 107 provides for a clear view of the face of the customer" (col. 9, lines 19-20). A convex mirror in Do would distort views therethrough and prevent the camera from capturing a clear view of a customer's face.

Do alone does not teach or suggest the recited apparatus. The Action's allegations are not based on any evidence in the record. *In re Zurko*, 258 F.3d 1379, 59 USPQ2d 1693 (Fed. Cir. 2001). *In re Lee*, 277 F.3d 1338, 61 USPQ2d 1430 (Fed. Cir. 2002). The Office has not established *a prima facie* case of obviousness.

### Claim 5

Claim 5 recites horizontally disposed first and second mirrors respectively positioned adjacent opposed sides of a user interface. Do further does not teach or suggest two mirrors. Do's sole camera (103) is strategically positioned to cover a wide field of view so it can clearly capture the customer's face. No other camera is suggested or needed. Nor has any evidence been presented that two cameras could jointly function in Do to meet the requirement of clearly capturing the customer's face. Thus, it is not obvious for Do to use more than one camera to capture the face of a customer. It follows that it is not obvious for Do to have more than one mirror.

Even if it were somehow possible (which it isn't) for Do to have two cameras, there is no suggestion that both cameras would require a mirror.

Even if it were somehow possible (which it isn't) for Do to have two cameras with mirrors, there is no suggestion of locating them on horizontally opposite sides of a user interface. As Do's camera is likely centered to capture a clear view of the face of the customer, any additional camera would also be centered. There is no suggestion for Do to have plural cameras, especially with them located on opposite sides of a user interface. The Office has not established *a prima facie* case of obviousness.

**Claim 6**

Do further does not teach or suggest horizontally disposed first and second convex mirrors respectively positioned adjacent opposed side of a user interface.

**Claim 7**

Amended claim 7 includes features from original claim 11. Also note Figures 26 and 27. Do does not teach or suggest an ATM having a mirror that extends further outward than the user interface. Furthermore, as previously discussed, Do requires that the "camera's field of view 107 provides for a clear view of the face of the customer." Moving Do's camera outward would reduce this field of view. Thus, Do teaches against a mirror extending further outward than the user interface, because such position would appear to prevent the camera from meeting the requirement of clearly capturing the customer's face. The Action lacks evidence of record. It is not obvious for Do to have a mirror positioned relative to the user interface in the manner recited. The Office has not established *a prima facie* case of obviousness.

## Claim 20

Do does not teach or suggest a light source that is positioned to focus light behind a user to obscure the view of nonusers to user input. Particularly note specification page 62, lines 6-17. Where does Do specifically target a light into nonusers to "blind" them (with brightness) from viewing user input? The Office has not established *a prima facie* case of obviousness.

## Fee For Additional Claims

Please charge the fee associated with the submission of three additional independent claims (\$264) and any other fee due to Deposit Account 09-0428.

## Conclusion

Each of Applicants' pending claims specifically recites features and relationships that are neither disclosed nor suggested in the applied prior art. Furthermore, the applied prior art is devoid of any such teaching, suggestion, or motivation of features so as to produce Applicants' invention. Allowance of all of Applicants' pending claims is therefore respectfully requested.

The undersigned will be happy to discuss any aspect of the Application by telephone at the Office's convenience.

Respectfully submitted,



Ralph E. Jocke Reg. No. 31,029  
WALKER & JOCKE  
231 South Broadway  
Medina, Ohio 44256  
(330) 721-0000